



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,675	01/27/2005	Graham Cotton	PA0254	1801

22840 7590 02/24/2006

AMERSHAM BIOSCIENCES
PATENT DEPARTMENT
800 CENTENNIAL AVENUE
PISCATAWAY, NJ 08855

EXAMINER

HAQ, SHAFIQUK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1641

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-10 and 12-13 drawn to product comprising compound of formula (II).

Group II, claims 1-9, 11 and 20-21, drawn to a product comprising compound of formula (III).

Group II, claims 14-19, drawn to a method for labeling a protein with the products of group I or group II.

2. The inventions listed in groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reason : Claim1 (group I and group II), at least is anticipated by prior art which teaches dye containing at least one target bonding group capable for covalent reaction with a thioester and having an affinity tag and the dye can be cyanine dye (US 2004/0248203 A1, paragraphs [0101-0102] and [0047]). Consequently, the special technical feature which links claims 2-10, 12-13 (group I) and 2-9, 11, 20-21 (Group II), cyanine containing

Art Unit: 1641

products, does not provide a contribution over the prior art. As MPEP 1893.03(d) notes "The expression special technical features is defined as meaning those technical features that define the contribution which each claimed invention, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art." In current case, claim 1 is drawn to products of group I and II, but the groups do not make a contribution over the prior art because the invention is taught by prior art. Therefore, there is no single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 and the lack of unity requirement is proper.

3. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. The species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. As for example, compounds of formula (III) (group II) are 7 to 9 membered fused ring compounds that are structurally and functionally distinct from the compounds of formula (II) of group I, which comprises 2-3 membered fused rings linked to another 2-3 membered fused rings through hydrocarbon chain containing multiple double bonds.
4. The compounds encompassed by inventions of groups I-II outlined above differ materially in chemical functionality and are structurally diverse and dissimilar compounds, which do not possess a substantial common core wherein a reference anticipating one would not necessarily render the other obvious.

Claims 1, 10, 11 and 14 are generic to plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species. **Where an election of any one of Groups I-III is made, an election of a single species compound is further required in accordance with the practice**

set forth in MPEP 803.02 including an exact definition of each substitution on the base molecule, wherein a single member at each substituent group or moiety is selected.

That is, if group I is elected, applicants must elect a specific (single) species for compounds of formula (I) and formula (II) wherein each and every variable is specifically defined and wherein a single member at each substituent group or moiety is elected and the elected species of formula (II) compound must read on the compound of formula (I) from which it depends.

If group II is elected, applicants must elect a specific (single) species for compounds of formula (I) and formula (III) wherein each and every variable is specifically defined and wherein a single member at each substituent group or moiety is elected and the elected species of formula (III) compound must read on the compound of formula (I) from which it depends.

If group III is elected, applicants must elect a specific (single) species for compound of formula (I) wherein each and every variable is specifically defined and wherein a single member at each substituent group or moiety is elected.

Formula (I), (II) and (III) compounds with various substitutions comprise plurality of compounds that are functionally and structurally distinct. As for example, L^1 and L^2 comprise groups selected from $-NR^1$, $-O-$, $-CH=CH-$, $-CO-NH-$, $- \{(CHR')_p-Q-(CHR')_r\}_s-$, which are structurally and functionally distinct. Bonding group F are selected from carboxylic acid thioester and aminothiol groups wherein L^1 also comprises distinct groups as discussed above and in combination will generate

plurality of patentably distinct compounds. Compounds of formula (III) can be 7 to 9 membered fused ring compounds that are structurally and functionally distinct from the compounds of formula (II) of group II, which may comprise 2-3 membered fused rings linked to another 2-3 membered fused rings through hydrocarbon chain containing multiple double bonds.

Chemical structures, which are similar, are presumed to function similarly, whereas chemical structures that are not similar are not presumed to function similarly. The presumption even for similar chemical structures though is not irrefutable, but may be overcome by scientific reasoning or evidence showing that the structure of the prior art would not have been expected to function as the structure of the claimed invention. Note that in accordance with the holding of *Application of Papesch*, 50 CCPA 1084, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) and *In re Lalu*, 223 USPQ 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1984), chemical structures are patentably distinct where the structures are either not structurally similar, or the prior art fails to suggest a function of a claimed compound would have been expected from a similar structure.

Upon the election of a single disclosed compound, the scope of the invention, inclusive of the elected compound, will be identified by the Examiner for examination along with the elected species. Moreover, whatever specific compound is ultimately elected, applicants are required to list all claims readable thereon. In the instant case, upon election of a single compound, the Office will review the claims and disclosure to determine the scope of the independent invention encompassing the elected compound (compounds which are so similar thereto as to be within the same

inventive concept and reduction to practice). The scope of an independent invention will encompass all compounds within the scope of the claim, which fall into the same class and subclass as the elected compound, but may also include additional compounds, which fall in related subclasses. Examination will then proceed on the elected compound AND the entire scope of the invention encompassing the elected compound will be determined. A clear statement of the examined invention, defined by those class(es) and subclass(es) will be set forth in the first action on the merits. Note that the restriction requirement will not be made final until such time as applicant is informed of the full scope of compounds along with (if appropriate) the process of using or making said compound under examination. This will be set forth by reference to specific class(es) and subclass(es) examined.

5. The species described above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding technical features for the following reasons: Pursuant to PCT Rule 13.2 and PCT Administrative instructions, Annex B, Part 1 (f)(I)(B)(2), the species are not art recognized equivalents.
6. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the compound are not patentably distinct species, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the compound to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P. §821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during

prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See M.P.E.P. § 804.01.

8. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143). Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must also include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be

Art Unit: 1641

accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(1)

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shafiqul Haq whose telephone number is 571-272-6103. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long V. Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SHAFIQUL HAQ
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1641



LONG V. LE 02/14/06
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1641